



**South Mountain Corridor Study  
Citizens Advisory Team  
Meeting Summary**

---

**Date:** March 18, 2008  
**Time:** 5:30 p.m.  
**Location:** South Mountain Community College

**CAT Members Attending:**

Camilo Acosta, Arlington HOA  
Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee  
Chad Blostone, The Foothills HOA  
Lisa Bray, South Mountain/Laveen Chamber of Commerce  
John Cochran, Calabrea HOA  
Tamala Daniels, South Mountain Village Planning Committee  
Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau  
Derrick Denis, Foothills Reserve HOA  
Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council  
Susan Higgins, Arizona Public Health Association  
Scott Mittelsteadt, Sierra Club  
Michael Norton, Laveen Village Planning Committee  
Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development  
John Rodriguez, Lakewood HOA  
Timothy Stone, Bougainvillea HOA  
Terry Tatterfield, Kyrene Elementary School District

**CAT Members Absent:**

Gila River Indian Community – District 4  
Sandy Bahr, Sierra Club  
Eric Baim, Silverado Ranch HOA  
Al Brown, Arizona Public Health Association  
Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee  
Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Diane Kreckler, Mountain Park Ranch HOA  
David Lafferty, City of Tolleson  
Cathy Lopez, Foothills Reserve HOA  
Dave Olney, Valley Forward  
Nathaniel Percharo, Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association  
Jack Sellers, East Valley Partnership  
Brian Smith, Calabrea HOA  
Carola Tamarkin, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce  
Carnell Thurman, City of Avondale  
Dave Williams, Arizona Trucking Association

**Staff and Consultants**

Michael Bruder, ADOT  
Mark Hollowell, ADOT  
Larry Langer, ADOT  
Floyd Roehrich, ADOT  
Timothy Tait, ADOT  
Bill Vachon, FHWA  
Mike Book, HDR  
Heather Honsberger, HDR  
Scott Mars, HDR  
Ben Spargo, HDR  
Fred Erickson, KCA  
Joy Butler, PDG  
Dean Howard, PDG

**Citizens:**

Don Herp  
Dan Johnson  
Steve Johnson  
Doug Mings  
Doug Murphy  
Frank Schmuck  
Colleen Sparks  
Irene Wesley

Meeting Agenda	Speaker
Welcome and introductions	Fred Erickson, KCA
CAT role and responsibilities	Fred Erickson, KCA
Team member questions and comments	All
Parking lot issues update	Ben Spargo, KCA
Floodplains	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Scott Mars, HDR
Jurisdictional waters	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Scott Mars, HDR
Water resources	Mark Hollowell, ADOT Scott Mars, HDR

*Meeting began at 6:02 p.m.*

**Fred Erickson:** Welcome to the March South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team Meeting. The first order of business is that the SMCAT representative from Silverado Ranch will no longer be able to participate. If anyone knows of anyone who could replace him as a representative of this community, please notify Tim Tait.

We have Douglas Mings here representing Harry Mitchell. Welcome. We also have a few people sitting in for SMCAT members who were unable to attend this meeting tonight. Tonight, Susan Higgins is sitting in for Al Brown with the Arizona Public Health Association. Derrick Denis is sitting in for Cathy Lopez with the Foothills Reserve Homeowners Association. And finally, we have Scott Mittelsteadt sitting in for Sandy Bahr with the Sierra Club. We appreciate these SMCAT members taking the initiative to have these representatives in attendance.

Right now, it appears that we only have eleven or twelve SMCAT members in attendance. We need fourteen to have a quorum. We will see if more members show up, but I don't think this will be an issue since I don't anticipate that we will have any items that we will be voting on tonight.

Here is tonight's agenda. We have started with the welcome and introductions. We will then review the SMCAT role and responsibilities and see if there are any team member questions or comments. The first presentation tonight will be on floodplains. We show that the break will be at this point, but we can determine if the break should be pushed back further, based on the time at that point. The other two presentation topics will be concerning the issues of jurisdictional waters and water resources. We will finish with the visitor comment session.

We are going to try something different tonight with the question-and-answer sessions. I will first ask for questions from the SMCAT. I will then go around the room asking that each member only ask one question as I go around. We will continue going around the room until either all the questions are answered or we run out of time in the question-and-answer session. Those questions that aren't answered will be placed in the parking lot issues memorandum. Because of this, it is important that you write these questions down on the blue question cards so we can include these as part of the meeting summary.

Are there any questions?

*No response*

**Fred Erickson:** Are there any questions regarding any recent reports in the media?

*No response*

**Fred Erickson:** Okay then let's continue forward. You all have seen the SMCAT purpose statement before. It is important to note the last sentence which states, "The single purpose of the SMCAT is to provide a build or no-build recommendation for the

South Mountain Freeway.” So as you are gathering the information that is presented in each of these meetings, it should be helping you get to a point where you can make a decision on whether you believe that this proposed freeway should be built or not.

As far as SMCAT meeting protocol, remember to show courtesy to those around you, as you would like to be treated.

I would like to mention that we have session feedback forms that we want the SMCAT members to complete and return. Take note that these forms are doubled-sided. We will be passing out these forms to you at the break. Just fill them out and return them to us by the end of the meeting. The idea about changing the method of the question-and-answer session came about because someone wrote this on his or her form from the February meeting, and the commenter felt that certain participants were dominating the conversation.

Here is the list of meeting topics for the next three meetings. We already discussed tonight’s topics. For the April 17 meeting, we plan on presenting information about visual resources, land use and biological resources. For the May 22 meeting, we will be presenting information about hazardous materials, energy, geotechnical issues and utilities.

The next two slides show the scheduled topics for future meetings. We have not decided on dates for each of these meetings. Those should be interesting meetings, as we go forward.

At the end of tonight’s meeting, we do allow the public an opportunity to make comments or ask questions. You can get blue question cards from Joy Butler, who is at the back of the room. Please write your questions on the blue card—one question per card. You can either read your question aloud or submit them and I will read them. Even if we don’t have time to get to all of your questions, write them down and get them to Joy so that they can be addressed in the parking lot issues memorandum.

Are there any questions?

**SMCAT Member:** So you are saying that all the questions we asked at the last meeting should be answered in the parking lot issues memorandum that was given to us?

**Fred Erickson:** That is a good lead in for Ben Spargo.

**Ben Spargo:** Everyone should have received a parking lot memorandum as part of your packet. This document includes questions that came both from the SMCAT members and the public. The first section of this document contains those questions that have associated ADOT responses. The end of the document has those questions that are still waiting an ADOT response. These questions will be answered in a parking lot issues memorandum at a future meeting. If you had a question at the last meeting that you feel

was not captured in the meeting summary or the parking lot issues memorandum, please let us know. Also if you had a question that was addressed in the parking lot issues memorandum, but you feel wasn't sufficiently addressed; let us know this as well.

**SMCAT Member:** Can I recommend that you distribute these documents to us more in advance of the meeting to give us a little more time for review?

**Ben Spargo:** Our intent is to get you the meeting information two weeks in advance of every SMCAT meeting. Based on there being less time between meetings this time around, we weren't able to do this.

**Fred Erickson:** We apologize about the time constraint this time.

**Ben Spargo:** There was a standing question in the last SMCAT meeting. Someone suggested that we give a monthly update on the status of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Tim, can you give us the update?

**Timothy Tait:** There is no recent news to report. ADOT is still working with the Gila River Indian Community to get resolution on the Traditional Cultural Property issue. This issue will need to be resolved before the Draft EIS can be finalized.

**Ben Spargo:** Thank you Tim. As I mentioned earlier, let us know if you feel your questions aren't being captured in the parking lot issues memorandum. If you don't feel this is the case, you can also let Fred or another member of the project team know so that we can follow up and make sure that you receive answers.

**SMCAT Member:** I am a little confused. I asked questions last meeting that are not included in the parking lot issue memorandum.

**Ben Spargo:** Please let us know what questions you asked that were not captured in the parking lot issues memorandum.

**SMCAT Member:** So what, you want me to fill out a blue question card?

**Fred Erickson:** Yes, that would be appreciated.

**SMCAT Member:** You are stockpiling the cards down there.

**Joy Butler:** I will bring some of the blue question cards to you.

**SMCAT Member:** I am a little frustrated. We didn't get this information with enough time to review. I have a question that should be included here.

**Timothy Tait:** Send me an e-mail so we can include your question in the parking lot issues memorandum.

**SMCAT Member:** I had a question but I wanted to think about it more before asking. I would like to get a response from the committee to see if I am off base or not. I have attended every SMCAT meeting except one. The last meeting was one of the most frustrating meetings that I have had to sit through. If one of us asked a question that was not built into the presentation, we weren't given an answer. We need to have a discussion about this so that we can have a better understanding. It seems that there were many project team staff in attendance that just sat there and didn't engage our questions. I do not think this is a good way to be running these meetings. I would like to know how the other committee members feel about this.

My other problem was that when I was a part of the original SMCAT, which was discussing the issues in the Western Section, ADOT would cut us off from any discussions about the Eastern Section. We did comment that some items had incorrect information and that they needed to be changed. We brought this up during those meetings. What I am seeing tonight is that some of the incorrect information is still included in the technical reports. I am assuming that this is the information that has been sent to the Federal Highway Administration to be reviewed. This makes me feel that there is a quality control issue about the information that we are bringing up in these meetings. It worries me that the federal government is reviewing this misinformation.

**Timothy Tait:** If you think there is misinformation in these reports, one way to express yourself is after the Draft EIS is released. There will be a public review period during this timeframe, where you will be able to submit written comments that will be included in the project record. ADOT and FHWA will review and consider these public comments. It is part of the process.

**Ben Spargo:** We have tried to make improvements to how the CAT meetings are being conducted. For instance, tonight the author from these three technical reports will be assisting on the presentation. We also are making sure that the ADOT and FHWA representatives are more available to answer your questions.

**SMCAT Member:** I am unsure if I am the only one who felt this way.

*Multiple people agreed that they felt the same way*

**Fred Erickson:** Can you give us any examples of information contained in the technical report summaries that you feel is incorrect?

**SMCAT Member:** In the original SMCAT meetings, our group felt that Sun Circle Trail should be incorporated in the plan. From what I have seen, ADOT has omitted this. Also, ADOT has seemed to ignore the most environmentally sensitive area, which is located between the north and south ridges in the South Mountains. In the last meeting, the ridge cuts were shown to us, but I didn't see anything that addressed the area to which I am referring. Still another example is the issue of drainage on the GRIC. In the original

SMCAT meetings, the GRIC had representatives who stated this was a major issue and it wasn't being addressed. They never seemed to get a straight answer to their question.

**Floyd Roehrich:** It depends on the intent of the SMCAT meetings. I attended the February meeting for the first time since the original SMCAT meetings. My understanding for these meetings is that the project team would be presenting all the information in the technical reports for each issue that you have requested. We have been on a quick pace to try to get through all the information and felt that any questions that were unanswered during these meetings could be addressed in the parking lot issues memorandum. We are on a fast pace, but if we need to spend more time on some issues, we can schedule more SMCAT meeting and do this. We definitely want to capture your questions and address them fully. I was under the impression that we would focus on the issues at hand during the particular meeting. If we address random issues at each meeting then we will never get through all the topics. Please let me know if the SMCAT has a different understanding of how these meetings are structured.

**SMCAT Member:** I thought the original SMCAT members and ADOT had agreed on making changes to this information. It appears that ADOT and HDR have not made these changes.

**Floyd Roehrich:** I am trying to figure out how to address your questions regarding those specific instances you have mentioned. But the study team is trying to get through the issues on tonight's agenda.

**SMCAT Member:** I was unable to attend the last meeting, but I read the meeting summary and the comments that were addressed. I realize that you want to stay on task, but how do we advance our understanding of the issues if our questions aren't being answered? It would also help if you introduced yourself to the group.

**Floyd Roehrich:** I am Floyd Roehrich, the Deputy State Engineer for ADOT. When Dan Lance retired, I filled his position. I am getting back into the process.

**SMCAT Member:** My point is that there is a frustration that I have. How does the SMCAT proceed when our questions aren't answered in these meetings?

**Floyd Roehrich:** I can't answer the specific issues why some information in the technical reports wasn't addressed. As for the issue of SMCAT member questions not being captured, our team needs to do a better job of that. If we need to have a meeting where we just have a question-and-answer session, we can do that. We can slip our schedule to accommodate that. Unless we hear from you that this is what you want to do, we will continue presenting the scheduled topics in sequence. We are trying to meet our commitment that we made to you.

**SMCAT Member:** I guess my suggestion is that we want to hear the information contained in each of these technical reports; however, if we have a question, I would like to see the question answered at that time. Then we can continue on the meeting timeline.

**Floyd Roehrich:** That was why we developed the parking lot issues memorandum. These questions that we couldn't fully address would be answered in this document. This will also give us an opportunity to expand on some of the answers that we have given here tonight. We will need to do a better job of capturing your questions so that you have all the information in place.

**SMCAT Member:** I think you are presenting the information that is contained in the Draft EIS. I see this as our opportunity to get a sneak peak at this document. I understand that some topics are forthcoming. If your questions don't get answered during these meetings, I see this as an opportunity from which you can build your argument for a response during the public review of the Draft EIS. This information is helping us to be more prepared. I personally want this information so I can have some expertise in these areas and speak knowledgeably about these issues to my constituents.

**SMCAT Member:** Yes, I recognize that staying on topic is important but I feel that our ability to ask questions and get them answered is a much more important piece of this process. If our questions aren't addressed then why are we here? We know that Ben knows all of the answers, but you have to realize that we don't.

**Floyd Roehrich:** I agree that Ben has been outstanding with this and yes, no one is disagreeing with you that your questions should be answered.

**Fred Erickson:** The process is in place. In the parking lot issues memorandum, some questions were answered and some didn't have answers yet, but would be addressed in a future memorandum. We will need to get caught up on this. For the next meeting, we have a little more time so this will give us a good opportunity to answer these questions.

**SMCAT Member:** I didn't get this information until today at 9:41 a.m.

**Fred Erickson:** We had 18 days to put all this information together. There was a lot of information to pull together and limited time to do it. We apologize for not being able to send this information sooner. For the April meeting, we will have a little more time to get the information ready.

**SMCAT Member:** I appreciate you trying to keep us on schedule. The original SMCAT meetings had many meetings that went late. So I can appreciate your efforts. When you answer questions, they are not always complete answers. From the last meeting, my question is here on page 6. I want a cost analysis for the parkway alternative.

It seems that the responses to our questions are always very short, containing no substantial information. The questions need to be answered completely. I have gotten to



the point where I feel I have to keep track of my questions to make sure that they are being addressed appropriately. I understand that many of the issues we have asked you to highlight are more substantial than in the Western Section. In the Eastern Section, we have all the issues associated with the South Mountains. We are being rushed along and scheduling is not our issue.

**Fred Erickson:** Do you feel that we are trying to cover too many topics in each meeting?

**Ben Spargo:** We made this schedule in the first meeting to present these specific topics.

**SMCAT Member:** I thought we were going to discuss these parking lot issues as part of this meeting

**Ben Spargo:** No, that is why we also included supplemental material in the back of the parking lot issues memorandum.

**SMCAT Member:** There is too much information and not enough time for us to review it.

**Fred Erickson:** So there are too many topics in each meeting?

**SMCAT Member:** Yes, for a two and a half hour meeting.

**Fred Erickson:** Should we be spreading these topics out?

**SMCAT Member:** I don't think the problem is with the amount of information that you present. The issue is that this information creates a lot of questions and that is what draws out the length of these meetings.

**Fred Erickson:** Do you have a suggestion to help us with this?

**SMCAT Member:** If I have a chance to see the information two weeks prior to the SMCAT meetings, I would be able to give you feedback on the material. But I couldn't give you any feedback this time around since I didn't know what was going to be presented.

**Fred Erickson:** I am trying to find an answer here.

**SMCAT Member:** Well it depends to whom you are asking that question. For me, floodplains are very understandable—other people may need more information on this issue.

**SMCAT Member:** Now is the time for us to get this information. After we get through these topics, we have the ability to request that information from these topics can be readdressed. I think we should move forward.

**Fred Erickson:** There is something else I would like to suggest. Please let us know if you feel the topics need to be more spread out.

I think we should continue with the topics on the agenda tonight. Later, we can reevaluate the topic list going forward.

**Timothy Tait:** We wanted to make these SMCAT meetings very self directed. Tell us what you want to see. If you want to just have a meeting where all we do is a question-and-answer session, let us know. You have to tell us what is important to you and if anything is not working you need to let us know. I have told the project team that heads will roll if we do not begin getting you the meeting information two weeks ahead of time. If you don't like what is happening with these meetings, work with Fred and Tom to make the situation better.

**Fred Erickson:** One way for you to let us know what you feel about these meetings is to complete the summary forms. Another way is for you to come and talk to me. If you want, we can push the schedule back a month and just do a question-and-answer session for the April meeting. Let's see what happens as we continue with today's meeting.

Let's move forward.

**Ben Spargo:** Presenting tonight's topics are Mark Hollowell who is the environmental lead from ADOT's Environmental Planning Group and Scott Mars who works for HDR Engineering and is the author of the Draft EIS sections for the floodplains, jurisdictional waters and water resource issues.

**Mark Hollowell:** Good evening and welcome. Tonight's presentation will be on water issues. I am going to talk about why we study each issue and Scott Mars will then talk about the project specifics.

Note that ADOT is working with various agencies on these issues.

The first topic we will be presenting tonight is floodplains. What are floodplains? A floodplain is a natural or man-made area that water passes through during times of high-water flow. By allowing water to flow into the floodplains, it reduces the risk of flooding to other areas.

The boundaries of the floodplain are determined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or you may know the agency as FEMA. Floodplains can also provide beneficial values such as wildlife habitat, recreational areas, farming areas, mining opportunities and groundwater recharge.

Structures such as buildings and bridge piers<sup>1</sup> located in floodplains could potentially reduce the ability of the floodplain to handle the high-water flows. There are regulations

in place that restrict what could be constructed in floodplains. A project like the South Mountain Freeway could require bridges over the floodplains and therefore bridge piers within the floodplain. The study team analyzed if such a crossing would cause any changes to floodplain values and boundaries in the study area. The findings will now be presented by Scott Mars.

**Scott Mars:** Thanks Mark. I presented to the SMCAT in 2006. It is a pleasure to be back again today.

<sup>1</sup>Bridge piers are a supporting structure at the junction of connecting spans of a bridge. Structures in the floodplain can reduce the potential to handle high water flows. There are two known floodplains in the study area, both located in the Western Section. There are no FEMA designated floodplains in the Eastern Section.

**SMCAT Member:** Do you count sheet flow as part of the floodplain?

**Scott Mars:** Yes, that would be correct.

**SMCAT Member:** It is my understanding that there should be floodplains in the Eastern Section. Why do you suggest that there are no floodplains there?

**Scott Mars:** There are jurisdictional waters in the Eastern Section. In this area, we are addressing ephemeral washes.

**SMCAT Member:** I don't understand.

**Scott Mars:** Floodplains are mapped by FEMA. There are no mapped floodplains in the Pecos Road alignment.

The Salt River floodplain is located along the north and south side of the river banks. It varies in width, but would be crossed by the W55 Alternative. The second floodplain is created by the elevated barriers associated with the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and the Roosevelt Irrigation District canal. This floodplain would also be crossed by the W55 Alternative.

The impacts presented are a worse-case scenario and represent the area of floodplain within the proposed freeway right of way. I will present later how the final floodplain impacts would be reduced if a freeway is constructed. As shown on the slide, the W55 Alternative would potentially impact 52.1 acres of floodplains. After construction, it is not anticipated that additional impacts would occur.

The South Mountain Freeway would provide an additional river crossing in an area where there are limited options for grade-separated crossings. If the freeway is not built, it is anticipated that the City of Phoenix or Maricopa County would need to construct additional bridges in order to meet the traffic demand in the area. These new river

crossings would have floodplain impacts. If low water crossings remain or new ones are constructed they would potentially become impassible during minor flooding.

As I mentioned before, the final floodplain impacts would be much less than the area presented in the previous slides. Standard ADOT design guidelines and construction standards would reduce the floodplain impacts. Bridges would be constructed over the floodplains in such a manner that they do not contribute to any substantial changes in flood water elevations.

Another way that ADOT could help reduce floodplain impacts would be to aid in the control of flooding. This would be accomplished based on the drainage system that is constructed to collect and convey on- and off-site water. In the Western Section, the water would be collected in a parallel channel and stored in strategically placed drainage basins. Eventually all of the water would be discharged into the Salt River. ADOT coordinates the freeway drainage system with the Flood Control District of Maricopa County as well as the US Army Corps of Engineers and the City of Phoenix to develop a flood control solution that benefits all of the surrounding communities.

With that, Mark and I will now take any questions you have.

**SMCAT Member:** The slide mentioned self-cleansing culverts. How large would these need to be to accommodate a 100-year storm?

**Scott Mars:** It depends, could be 2-6 feet, but they would be larger than culverts that are not self cleansing.

**SMCAT Member:** How many 100-year flood events has the area had in the last 30 years?

**Scott Mars:** I am unsure, but I know we had one in 1993.

**SMCAT Member:** Have you considered evaluating for a 500-year storm event?

**Scott Mars:** A 100-year storm event is the standard that is used for planning purposes.

**SMCAT Member:** FEMA doesn't update their mapping often. How updated are the maps that you are using? This is a large area that we are discussing (Eastern Section).

**Scott Mars:** FEMA has recently taken all their maps and put them into a digital format. Many of these maps have been updated.

**SMCAT Member:** So you feel you have used updated floodplain information?

**Scott Mars:** There have been many changes throughout the process.

**Ben Spargo:** The historical data for rainfall was recently updated. The models will be using this updated data when sizing culverts, channels and basins.

**SMCAT Member:** FEMA will generally give us a general 100-year storm data. For a large area such as this, what about storms that are localized. Is there something accounting for this?

**Scott Mars:** When the drainage goes into the larger tributaries, it is accounted for.

**SMCAT Member:** Based on pre-established rainfall, what is the amount of rain that would fall in a 100-year storm in 2 hours?

**Scott Mars:** One thing that is determined is how much water would be carried into man-made channels. This has huge project impacts.

**SMCAT Member:** The calculations should be based on permeability. If any of these numbers are off, it will skew your perception.

**Scott Mars:** We take into account the type of material at the ground surface. The type of material that exists, such as asphalt, makes a significant difference and is taken into account.

**Fred Erickson:** Are there any other questions?

**SMCAT Member:** The Draft EIS is based on some older data. You said that there is now updated data. How does this new data get incorporated into the process? I assume you are using the latest data for design but not for the decision on build or no build. How do we account for this?

**Fred Erickson:** Were you asking if the Draft EIS uses the most current floodplain information?

**Ben Spargo:** It does. It has been updated with the latest Maricopa County information.

**SMCAT Member:** Has the information been updated but not incorporated?

**Ben Spargo:** The averages would reflect the most current FEMA updates.

**SMCAT Member:** I think what you are saying is that there is updated data out there, but not necessary incorporated into the Draft EIS.

**Ben Spargo:** FEMA has updated their information and we are using this updated information in the Draft EIS.

**SMCAT Member:** How often is this information updated?

**Scott Mars:** Letters of map revisions are submitted. Not all of these mean a change in the floodway. Some of the changes could be administrative—such as changing the map labeling.

**SMCAT Member:** You said that FEMA digitized their maps. So they took the old data and digitized it? I have seen some FEMA maps so out of date that they are unusable. Are you saying you are using FEMA data without doing your own analysis?

**Ben Spargo:** We have built our own model to study the area drainage waters. So we are taking into account all the recent changes.

**SMCAT Member:** I don't understand how you can be reviewing the information in the Draft EIS, and updating the information, even though it is being reviewed.

**Scott Mars:** We do have a process that allows for this.

**SMCAT Member:** When was the original floodplain information used to create this section in the Draft EIS?

**Scott Mars:** The original technical report was done in 2005.

**SMCAT Member:** So the data is three years old? So when we see it in the Draft EIS during the public review period, the document will have antiquated data?

**Scott Mars:** This is not true. We check and see if there have been any changes. If there have, we make the change then and there.

**Ben Spargo:** That would be true for all of the environmental documents.

**Fred Erickson:** Any more questions?

**SMCAT Member:** I am still confused when you say there is no floodplain in the Eastern Section. Maybe it is because I am missing the definition. It looks like there would be a floodplain in this area.

**Ben Spargo:** Part of it the reason there is no floodplain here is because of the physical barriers in the area. They are designed to channel the water flow.

**SMCAT Member:** So you are talking about is a physical barrier as opposed to an area that has water running across it?

**Ben Spargo:** Yes.

**SMCAT Member:** There were some flood control measures there before the development occurred. Some years ago, this area was engineered for this.

**SMCAT Member:** I am not sure if it was Del Webb Corp. that developed this area, but they made sure that there would be no floodplains on that side of the South Mountains. I am on the other side of the mountains and I get flooding. Del Webb made sure that Ahwatukee would never be in a floodplain and that is why there is no floodplain here. A 100-year storm could occur at any time—even this year. Then there could be huge issues with flooding. The developers figured out to channel the water into culverts, which would flow to the GRIC. Because of this, Ahwatukee is full of trenches.

**SMCAT Member:** In the original SMCAT meetings, the GRIC brought up some of these issues. I wish they would be in attendance tonight so I could hear their thoughts.

**SMCAT Member:** So the water flows would be maintained, as they currently exist on the GRIC lands? Maintaining these types of flows on their lands is not the right way to do it. What level of water is flowing on the GRIC lands on an annual basis? Is there any goal to improve the City of Phoenix retention? Is this a project team goal to not allow this additional water to flow there?

**Ben Spargo:** I think some of these issues will be addressed as ADOT continues their discussions with the GRIC. Yes, drainage will be one of the major issues. At this point, we haven't received any recent input from them on this.

**Floyd Roehrich:** The recent right-of-entry permit that the GRIC issued to ADOT allows for us to start studying how these issues will affect the GRIC lands. There are laws and statutes for these things that will also have to adhere to as we work through this process. As we continue our work, we will consider what the issues are and what will need to be done to mitigate these issues. Some of the issues will be addressed during final design, such as through the sizing of culverts and channels.

**SMCAT Member:** I think my major concern is that the GRIC will not accept any additional flows on their lands that would be caused by this potential freeway and that the condition will have to be addressed before the process can proceed. I'm concerned that this could affect the number of homes impacted.

**Floyd Roehrich:** We do not know what level of flow would be acceptable. Again, as we have these discussions, it would be presented to the group. We are just now at the preliminary stage.

**SMCAT Member:** Are 404 washes considered jurisdictional waters?

**Scott Mars:** Yes, they are.

**Fred Erickson:** It is time to take a break. We now have 16 SMCAT members in attendance so we officially have a quorum. You all are doing a good job of keeping your comments until the end of each topic presentation. Near the end of this meeting, we will get to your blue question cards. Also, please remember to complete and return your session feedback forms at the end of meeting. We will resume the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

*Break*

**Fred Erickson:** We are going to continue with the presentation. The next topic is jurisdictional waters.

**Mark Hollowell:** The term, jurisdictional waters, is a common term used when referring to “waters of the United States” as described in the Clean Water Act. They both refer to water features that are regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). The types of water features include interstate lakes, rivers, intermittent and perennial streams, springs, riverbeds, wetlands, and more. The water features are mapped and coordination with the Corps is extensive to identify and delineate the limits and what constitutes a jurisdictional waters.

The regulation process includes the requirement that ADOT obtain a permit for discharging water into or removing materials from the area defined as a jurisdictional water. Also, ADOT works with the Corps to develop ways to minimize and mitigate any impacts. The greater the project activity, the more complex the permitting process is and the more difficult it is to obtain permit approval. The study team determined if and where jurisdictional waters are located within the study area and how the proposed freeway alternatives might affect jurisdictional waters in accordance with the requirements set forth in the Clean Water Act.

**Scott Mars:** Thank you Mark. The study team coordinated with the US Army Corps of Engineers to identify the jurisdictional waters in the study area. From there, additional field visits were conducted to determine if there were any additional washes that may qualify as a jurisdictional water. The result was the identification of the Salt River in the Western Section and numerous washes located in the Eastern Section.

At this time, the dry washes located throughout the mountain areas and along the Pecos Road section qualify as a jurisdictional water. These washes are ephemeral and only convey water during and for a short period after rain. The photos in the exhibit are representative of the typical ephemeral wash in the Eastern Section.

Similar to the floodplain impacts, these areas shown are a worse case scenario and represent the entire width of the floodway of the jurisdictional water within the proposed freeway right-of-way. Later, I will discuss ways that ADOT would reduce or eliminate the impacts if a build option were selected.



In addition to the direct impacts to the waterways, additional impacts could continue to occur after construction. Since runoff water would potentially be discharged into the jurisdictional waters, ADOT would work with the Corps and would implement measures to ensure that the freeway would not adversely impact the integrity of the jurisdictional waters. Also, ADOT would coordinate the discharge of the water into the Salt River with the Corps and City of Phoenix since they may have related projects in the area.

Similar to the floodplains analysis, if the freeway were not built, there would be no freeway-related impacts on the jurisdictional waters. However, since the population and traffic demand is expected to continue to increase in the study area, it is anticipated that existing crossings may need to be widened and new crossings may need to be constructed. In both cases, there would be impacts on jurisdictional waters from these arterial crossings.

ADOT would institute measures to ensure that no further impacts such as erosion or water quality degradation would occur on the jurisdictional waters. These measures would be described during the permitting process with the Corps. In the Eastern Section, some of the washes would be crossed with bridges instead of culverts to avoid jurisdictional waters impacts and to allow wildlife movement.

The ADOT standard construction specifications include a number of measures to reduce impacts during construction of the freeway. They have been developed in coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers to reduce the risk of impacts to water quality and the integrity of jurisdictional waters.

Mark and I will now take questions.

**SMCAT Member:** Was it ever settled who owns the Salt River?

**Scott Mars:** The best answer would be that it is a mixed bag of ownership. We have developed a graphic that shows this. Ben, is this graphic on a slide in tonight's presentation?

**Ben Spargo:** No.

**SMCAT Member:** I know there have been court cases about ownership of the Salt River bottom. Is there still any question of the ownership there?

**Ben Spargo:** I am aware that the Bureau of Land Management owns some, with sand and gravel operations owning other portions. It includes mixed ownership.

**Bill Vachon:** I am unaware if there has been a decision in that lawsuit.

**SMCAT Member:** Is there a formal definition for a wash's boundary?

**Scott Mars:** The boundary would be the ordinary high-water mark. This is often on the edge of the wash where you sometimes see litter and natural debris.

**SMCAT Member:** What about the fringe?

**Scott Mars:** If there is erosion, that could be considered the high-water mark. These things are not always cut and dry.

**SMCAT Member:** So this is negotiated?

**Scott Mars:** Yes, it can be.

**SMCAT Member:** Have you run models with a certain level of water to see the affects on the study area?

**Scott Mars:** No, at this point we have not finalized this.

**SMCAT Member:** I would think we would need that information. When you design this, wouldn't you say that X amount of water is flowing through the project area?

**Ben Spargo:** We will use data from existing conditions and analyze how much water flow is coming through the washes. Then we will run the data through a model that would show what would happen if the South Mountain Freeway were in place and evaluate the changes in the on- and off-site drainage.

**SMCAT Member:** You haven't run this information through the model yet?

**Ben Spargo:** We have taken this information to a certain level.

**SMCAT Member:** It seems generalized. What if the final analysis is off, and you will need an additional 50 to 200 acres to accommodate drainage facility right-of-way?

**Ben Spargo:** As we continue the study process, we will be receiving more detailed information and we will continue to evaluate this.

**SMCAT Member:** This process seems to be missing an element.

**Bill Vachon:** At a certain point, we take the analysis to a certain level. We then look to see what the issues are and we try to do enough analysis to address these issues. Is this level of analysis equal to the effort done in final design? No. It is understood that we will have to tweak a few things. I hope we are not that far off in our analysis to the point that we would need an additional 50 to 200 acres.

**SMCAT Member:** A bullet on slide 34 states that culverts would be placed at some locations to avoid hindering wildlife movement. What about bridges, would they hinder wildlife movement? Will that information be presented tonight?

**Ben Spargo:** In an upcoming SMCAT meeting, we will be reviewing the biological issues. It will be presented at that point.

**SMCAT Member:** It will just be a discussion on the impacts and not where the crossings would occur.

**Ben Spargo:** No, we have laid out proposed locations for wildlife crossings.

**SMCAT Member:** What would be an acceptable level of how much your analysis of projected flood waters in the area could be changed, plus or minus 20 percent?

**Bill Vachon:** I don't have a good feel for what some other studies have come up with. These issues can be addressed by doing things, such as upgrading culvert sizes. If we notice that current weather patterns have created recent levels of excessive area flooding, we would have to update that information.

**Floyd Roehrich:** We have to identify the order of magnitude. Would we have more on-site storage through retention basins or would we use other options? These things would be addressed during final design.

**SMCAT Member:** Can the drainage facilities be made deeper so as not to change the footprint and take more homes? My constituents would find this to be a better alternative than taking more homes.

**SMCAT Member:** The data for homes located in the project's right-of-way take isn't completely accurate at this point. The amount of homes could be slightly greater or smaller.

**Floyd Roehrich:** Yes, we are assessing the mitigation for these homes. We are trying to have as minimal an impact as possible. The purpose of this study is not to devastate the area.

**SMCAT Member:** How do the impacts to residences in this area compare to those for the other freeways that have been recently constructed? I suggest that you do a design study before you make a decision whether or not to build this freeway.

**Floyd Roehrich:** I don't know what that process is going to get us. In some areas, we will have to tweak items and how is this communicated to you? There are a lot of laws that dictate how the process needs to go and we need to follow them. We have to ensure that our proposed plan is defensible to legal scrutiny.

**SMCAT Member:** I am so frustrated. If there is a subdivision that needs water for golf course then they get it. Why isn't there some sort of tank storage and pump system for saving rainwater so that it can be used later when it is needed? Why aren't you coming up with creative ways of storing excess water rather than channeling it on the GRIC lands? You should be thinking of creative solutions to some of these issues.

**Fred Erickson:** Let's now move to the final topic.

**Mark Hollowell:** Our final topic tonight is water resources. The water resources analysis is essentially a catch-all for any groundwater or surface water impacts. The impacts are mainly described in a qualitative nature. It is possible to develop quantitative impacts for fixed features such as wells.

Water is an extremely important resource, especially in a desert environment like Phoenix. Conserving water and keeping the water quality good is of the utmost importance. We depend on both surface water and groundwater supplies for our every day uses such as drinking water, irrigation, flood control and recreation.

If not planned for and constructed properly, a freeway could alter the surface and ground water conditions by changing the levels of water flow, changing the direction of water flow, or changing the quality of water in the study area. These impacts could potentially have effects on adjacent vegetation and habitat. In addition, wells located within the freeway right-of-way would need to be capped and new wells located. Conversely, off-site surface water flows, if left uncontrolled could cause substantial damage to a project like this proposed freeway.

**Scott Mars:** Thank you Mark. What impacts could occur from construction? The water quality impacts could occur during construction as well as after construction is complete during the normal operation of the freeway. In both cases, ADOT has standard practices that would ensure impacts are reduced or eliminated. For example, impacted wells would need to be relocated or compensated for.

The exhibit on this slide shows the wells located within the Eastern Section. The yellow dots designate the wells listed by the Arizona Department of Water Resources. These wells are used for monitoring, production, geotechnical, observation, domestic uses, testing purposes, or irrigation. The blue dots designate the public water supply wells owned by the Gila River Indian Community. It is important to note that each of the dots on the map is an approximate well location and that one of the dots may be representative of more than one well.

In total, the construction of the proposed freeway would impact 43 wells—17 in the Western Section and 26 in the Eastern Section. As mentioned before, during and after construction, it is possible for surface and ground water quality to be altered, but ADOT has measures that mitigate these potential impacts.

There are a few challenges that are anticipated with regard to managing water runoff along the freeway. They include the crossings of the major water features in the Western Section including the Roosevelt Irrigation District Canal, the Salt River and the Laveen Area Conveyance Channel. Though the South Mountains, runoff control could be challenging. Through coordination with the appropriate agencies and proper design, these issues would be resolved.

If the freeway was not built, there would be no freeway-related impacts. However, similar to the other topics, the continued growth in the study area would potentially result in water resources impacts.

Similar to the mitigation for the other topics, ADOT would develop a plan for avoiding, reducing or otherwise mitigating water related impacts. The plan would be developed in coordination with the Corps and would meet or exceed the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Eliminate System and the Clean Water Act.

As you can see on this slide, the pollution prevention plan would include a number of practices that would be followed during the construction of the proposed freeway.

The next few slides deal directly with well impacts. I will present the information, but we have Pete Eno here from the ADOT Right-of-Way Group to help answer any specific questions at the end of the presentation. Any new wells would be installed per the guidelines of the Arizona Department of Water Resources. Any well that is impacted would be replaced or compensated for fully.

ADOT's preferred method of replacing the well would be to have the owner replace the well outside of the proposed freeway right-of-way. However, relocation of a well more than 660 feet from the original location can be a complex matter. ADOT would negotiate the replacement cost and it would include the cost for any hydrological studies, drilling, final well development and reconnection.

Another way to replace the well would be to have ADOT perform the studies and well development. ADOT would prefer to do this on the owner's property, but if needed, additional right-of-way could be purchased for the purpose of well relocation. In both cases, the new well location would need to produce water comparable in quality and quantity and would not change the water rights.

If neither of these options are feasible, ADOT would replace the water using other sources such as potable or waste water. The negotiation would include any additional cost for this new water source as well as the value of the water rights. It is also possible that ADOT could compensate the well owner without replacing the well.

Mark, Pete Eno and I, are now ready to answer any questions you may have on this issue.

**SMCAT Member:** Are the wells sites shown on the map in the presentation all active wells?

**Scott Mars:** They show all the various types of wells, including the abandoned ones. These abandoned wells are filled with either grout or cement. The points on the map would include these abandoned wells.

**SMCAT Member:** Is there a way to find out which wells are which?

**Scott Mars:** Yes, it will be shown in the Draft EIS.

**Ben Spargo:** That information is not in the technical summary, but if you would like it, we can get that to you.

**SMCAT Member:** So if someone moves a well and relocates it more than 660 feet it would become a complex issue and moving it less than this distance would be simpler?

**Scott Mars:** Yes. If the well is moved more that 660 feet, a well impact analysis would need to be done. Staying within the 660 feet would be an advantage.

**SMCAT Member:** How does compensation for lost wells work? Let's say that the well cannot be replaced. How much would ADOT compensate the well owner?

**Pete Enno:** At this point, I don't know. I have been doing some research to find experts in this field, but haven't found anyone yet.

**SMCAT Member:** I would think it would be easy to determine the compensation. The City should know the cost of potable water. It should be known how much water the well would produce. This should be equal to the dollar amount that ADOT would owe the well owner.

**Pete Enno:** In any case, we would be determining a fair value and we would be paying that amount to the well owner.

**SMCAT Member:** How long would the well owner be compensated, 100 years?

**Pete Enno:** That's one of the issues that needs to be worked out. We would be paying for the property and the water itself.

**SMCAT Member:** How many wells would you think that this project would affect that would need to be replaced?

**Scott Mars:** We don't have an exact number since we haven't done the field surveys for these yet.

**SMCAT Member:** So you have no idea how many wells would be lost?

**Scott Mars:** The worst-case scenario is 26 wells in the Eastern Section and 17 in the Western Section.

**SMCAT Member:** So you don't have any idea how many wells would actually need to be replaced?

**Scott Mars:** We would have to do a field survey to determine that.

**Pete Eno:** My experience has been that the number of wells that would need to be replaced would be an amount much lower than 26.

**SMCAT Member:** In my area, I only know of one active well.

**Fred Erickson:** Are there any other questions?

*No response*

**Fred Erickson:** Thank you very much. At this point in time, we will begin the public question-and-answer session.

Also, please remember to fill out your session feedback forms. I had a suggestion that some people may not have time to fill out these forms. How about if I send an electronic version of this form to those people who don't return the form tonight?

*No response*

**Fred Erickson:** Are there any more blue cards from the public that need to be turned in?

*No response*

**Fred Erickson:** Is there anyone who would like to read their own comment or question?

*No response*

**Public Question:** There are approximately 620 undeveloped acres in Ahwatukee. When designing for the drainage facilities, will this acreage be complied as developed or undeveloped? Knowing that in the near future this area will be developed.

**SMCAT Member:** The problem I see is that this undeveloped land is in negotiations with developers right now.

**SMCAT Member:** I heard that there is a development group in place. But that only the northern end would be affected.

**SMCAT Member:** There are houses in the northern and southern sections.

**SMCAT Member:** The development agreement is currently being negotiated and that may add another impact to this project.

**Bill Vachon:** Yes, that could affect this project. We won't know until our final design is in place.

**Floyd Roehrich:** We are working with the cities to address their planning efforts and how they relate to this project.

**SMCAT Member:** I think the area that is more important is west of 620.

**SMCAT Member:** Aren't developers aware that there is a freeway on the books?

**Public Question:** Does the Gila River Indian Community fall under the jurisdiction of FEMA floodplains and if not what jurisdiction is being used with rain would run off during heavy storms flowing south onto GRIC land.

**Scott Mars:** FEMA has not mapped the GRIC lands. So in this respect, there is a hole in the mapping data. That is an issue as we continue going forward in this process. This situation is typical of Native American lands in the United States.

**Public Question:** When were the FEMA floodplain maps updated? Could you please show the past and present maps at the next meeting? This would be great help showing in fact where the floodplains once were and where are now? With such a great amount of change from 1985-2008 in Ahwatukee this would be a great starting and end point of the FEMA floodplains maps.

**Timothy Tait:** If this is something of interest to the group, we will provide this. If only a few people want to see this, we can provide it to you individually.

**Fred Erickson:** Would the group like to see this?

**SMCAT Member:** I would like to see this shown over both the Western and Eastern sections.

**Timothy Tait:** This information for both of the areas is available on the project Web site. I can send you the link to access this.

**Fred Erickson:** Can I get a show of hands for people who would like this information?

*Some hands were raised*



**Fred Erickson:** Less than half raised their hands.

**Timothy Tait:** We will put this information in your packets.

**SMCAT Member:** Can the information given to us have updated information for the Western Section?

**Floyd Roehrich:** It shouldn't be a problem since this is a living document.

**Timothy Tait:** For the time being, we will include what we have and we will provide any updated information to you at a later point.

**SMCAT Member:** When was the last time that FEMA has updated their maps? Have they done any updates since 1985?

**Scott Mars:** They update different sections every year.

**SMCAT Member:** So they would need to send out a survey crew to do this?

**Scott Mars:** Not necessarily. There are different reasons for updating the maps.

**SMCAT Member:** My issue is that these maps haven't been updated since 1985. Wouldn't survey crews need to come out to this area if the maps were being updated?

**Floyd Roehrich:** ADOT doesn't control FEMA.

**SMCAT Member:** I am trying to figure out if you are using current data. There may be something in the area that could be changing the drainage patterns since 1985. Something like a salt sage could have grown since then and changed the channel. I really don't care about the map revisions done because the map letter changed. Are you using the most accurate information here?

**Fred Erickson:** They will be able to answer that question as part of the parking lot issues memorandum.

**Public Question:** How will rain water from heavy storms (i.e., 5, 10, 20 and 100 year rains) be collected retained and then released due to the placement of South Mountain Loop 202. Will this cause soil erosion down stream of retention? Please have ADOT or HDR Engineering show drawings and maps of the planned rainwater collection and release system and include these in the EIS. Please explain how many acre-feet or gallons will flow and be collected during the above mentioned scenarios.

**Ben Spargo:** Generally, the drainage design includes channels parallel to the freeway to collect water. Box culverts, bridges, and retention basins are also used as part of the system. In order to keep the water flowing at the existing rates in the Western Section, we

would be using a combination of these elements. The drainage basin issues were covered in the presentation last month.

**Floyd Roehrich:** In the February SMCAT meeting, we showed some conceptual layouts to show the collection and discharge of drainage into the river. This content is currently posted on the project Web site.

**Fred Erickson:** Yes, it is located on the Web site.

**Public Question:** Will there only one EIS submitted for both the East and West side of South Mountain Loop 202 meaning the connection from the West side of 10 (51<sup>st</sup>) to the eastern end where it connects back to I-10 just north of the GRIC?

**Floyd Roehrich:** Yes.

**Public Question:** How will the 30 acres be released from city ownership to state ownership to construction of the South Mountain Freeway? What city and staff officials will sign the document turning over this parkland to the state?

**Timothy Tait:** We are continuing to work with the City of Phoenix on this issue. They are an active member in this process.

**Public Question:** Now that the West side of the South Mountain Freeway has been selected, where will the I-10 Reliever or after the renaming by ADOT State Route 801 connect to the South Mountain Freeway (at what specific point)?

**Mike Bruder:** We are still working on this. It is possible that State Route 801 would connect with the South Mountain Freeway near Broadway Road.

**Public Question:** I might be off on the total but I thought I heard earlier that 3 million cubic yards of soil would be removed from S Mt Park (Mtn). Please explain just what ADOT will do with all this soil. Please show a graph on what percentage will be used for highway construction and how much will be hauled away. Please include the destination if hauled away.

**Ben Spargo:** This topic was asked at the last meeting and addressed in the parking lot issues memorandum. Much of the excavated material would be used for fill embankment. Large boulders that are excavated could be used for riprap or structural backfill.

**Public Question:** Many questions were asked about human health from the affects of traffic to people living adjacent to this highway and others up to 1km away. Will all these questions be included and answered in the Environmental Impact Statement(s) for S Mt Loop 202.

**Timothy Tait:** All the questions submitted during the public review period after the Draft EIS is released will be documented and addressed as part of the Draft EIS.

**Fred Erickson:** Any more questions?

**SMCAT Member:** I wish the Sierra Club lady was here (the Sierra Club was represented by an alternate at this meeting). I find it abhorrent that you would even consider buying the well water that Valley residents are asked to conserve. But yet, you want to pay so that millions of gallons of water is used to fill lakes at a golf course.

**Timothy Tait:** That would not be our first choice.

**SMCAT Member:** It shouldn't be any choice.

**Timothy Tait:** The presentation seemed too technical. Was it? Were you okay with how the information it was presented?

*Affirmative response*

**SMCAT Member:** Can we get a commitment that we will have all our materials two weeks before the next SMCAT meeting?

**Tim Tait:** Yes, I am working with our team to get this information to you sooner; I'm looking at Dean Howard on this one.

**Dean Howard:** Yes. Just be aware that this will give us less time to address some of the items in the parking lot issues memorandum. Some of these items will be unable to be addressed.

**Floyd Roehrich:** Let us know if you feel that we are missing any questions in the parking lot issue memorandum. Also let us know if you don't think we are fully addressing your question.

**Timothy Tait:** We will need to find a balance.

**SMCAT Member:** I would like for us to be able to see the SMCAT PowerPoint presentation five to seven days before the meeting. The city and counties all give us a week to review theirs, but I know how these things go.

**Timothy Tait:** The timing of this meeting was a challenge. The technical summaries for this meeting were given to you at the February SMCAT meeting. We will work to get you the presentation ahead of time. As for the parking lot issues memorandum, if you have any questions or comments, please let Tom, Fred or I know.

**Fred Erickson:** The topics for the April 17 SMCAT meeting are: visual resources, land use and biological resources.

**Timothy Tait:** Are these too many topics?

*A response indicating that it wouldn't be too many topics*

**SMCAT Member:** Most of our questions will probably be concerning the biological and land use issues.

**SMCAT Member:** I think the land use will be easy. The biological issues will raise more concerns.

**SMCAT Member:** Is there some way to make sure that Sandy Bahr or someone from the Sierra Club attends?

**Fred Erickson:** Well, Scott Mittelsteadt who has been sitting in for Sandy Bahr has been attending the past few SMCAT meetings in Sandy's place. So a representative from the Sierra Club has been attending each of these meetings.

Please fill out and return your session feedback forms.

Is there a motion to adjourn?

**SMCAT Member:** Motion.

**Fred Erickson:** Second?

**SMCAT Member:** I second the motion.

**Fred Erickson:** The meeting is adjourned.

*Meeting ended at 8:31 p.m.*

**The following questions were submitted on the blue question cards following the meeting:**

- **CAT Written Question:** How much water is currently flowing to GRIC property (yearly)? What changes will be designed into the culvert/water management system with the proposed Pecos Rd. alignment to maintain current flows onto GRIC?
- **CAT Written Question:** What is the footprint of the Loop 101 ROW as per slide 30?

- **CAT Written Question:** Slide 12 from previous 02/28 presentation says that a parkway causes impacts. Please give us an analysis of the cost differential between the proposed freeway and a possible parkway in regards to home displacement, business relocation, ROW acquisition, and environmental impacts.

Report this in dollars not philosophy/narrative.